



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

FAUST IN ENGLISH AND IN ENGLAND.

1. Die Englischen Übersetzungen von Goethe's Faust. Von Lina Baumann. Halle a. S. Verlag von Max Niemeyer. 1907. pp. vi+122.
2. Bayard Taylor's Translation of Goethe's Faust. By Juliana Haskell, A. M., Columbia University, New York. 1908. pp. xi+111.
3. The Reception of Goethe's Faust in England in the first half of the nineteenth century. By William Frederic Hauhart, Ph. D., New York. The Columbia University Press. 1909. pp. x+148.

The author of the first book states in the "Vorwort" that the purpose of the study is to review the various English translations of the first part of Goethe's *Faust*. Nine translations of the second part are mentioned but not discussed—an anonymous translation appearing in 1838, and the translations by Bernays, Birch, Gurney, Swanwick, Anster, Clarke, Martin, and Taylor. (The translation by Macdonald which is mentioned in Taylor's introduction is not cited.) Then follows a short and concise chapter on *Faust* in England before Goethe. Attention is called to P. F. Gent's translation of the *Faustbuch* of 1587, to Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, to the English version of 1594, to the *Nova Solyma* of 1648, to the versions by W. Mountford, by John Thurmond, and by numerous unknown authors.

In the third chapter is given a bibliographical list of all the English translations of the first part of Goethe's *Faust*. Stage versions and fragmentary translations (those by Shelley and by Retzsch, for instance) are excluded. The list includes altogether thirty-five titles, and ranges chronologically from Gower's translation of 1823 to McLintock's of 1897. To this list might be added another translation which appeared recently: *Faust* freely adapted from Goethe's Poem by Stephen Phillips and J. Comyns Carr, New York, Macmillan Co., 1908.

That fifteen years elapsed between the appearance of the completed first part of *Faust* (1808) and the appearance of Gower's translation (1823) may cause surprise. This gap is bridged, however, by a work which is not mentioned in L. Baumann's study—Madame de Staël's book on Germany. *De l'Allemagne* appeared first in 1810, but the edition was almost immediately confiscated and destroyed by the French authorities. In 1813 a new edition appeared in London; an English translation was published the same year. In 1814 a new English edition appeared. Chapter 23 of the second part of Madame de Staël's work deals with Goethe's *Faust*, and contains translations of

various scenes along with a running commentary and a general summary. The importance of Madame de Staël's work should not be underestimated. The English translation of *De l'Allemagne* was for English-speaking countries practically the first introduction to Goethe's *Faust*.

Mr. Rea in his study on the English translations of Schiller's dramas* attempted to sum up briefly every one of the translations. The author of the study on *Faust* translations has wisely decided to limit the discussion to six types of translations—(1) those which give the sense of the original but not the form, (2) those which take as a basis the main thought of the original and then develop that thought according to the translator's ideas, (3) those which follow the original in some respects, expand it in others, and generally use arbitrary metres, (4) those which follow the original closely but use arbitrary metres, (5) those which follow the original and reproduce the metres, (6) those which attempt to reproduce the metres but fail to catch the poetic inspiration and fluency of the original. One translation is discussed in detail from each group—Hayward, Anster, Martin, Swanwick, Taylor, McLintock. The translations by Peithmann and by "Beta" are put in the Hayward group; Anster stands alone in his group; Martin is the most striking representative in his group; most of the thirty-five translations belong to the Swanwick group; with Taylor are classed Brooks, Arnold, and Claudy; McLintock and Latham form the last group.

Hayward's prose translation is credited with paving the way, by its careful rendering of the German, for the later English translations; through the translator's "disregard of the beauties which are commonly thought peculiar to poetry" he has, unfortunately, done little to give the English public a clear conception of the real *Faust* of Goethe. For Anster's translation, or rather adaptation, little sympathy is shown; Anster has changed the content of the poem and has distorted the characters of Faust and Gretchen. Martin's translation surpasses Anster's in that it possesses grace and fluency and reproduces faithfully the main characters; it fails, however, to sound the poetic depths of the original. Miss Swanwick's translation fails to reproduce the feminine rhymes of the original, and fails to catch the force of many of Goethe's phrases; of the many translations in the group, hers is the best, and it has served as a model for many subsequent translations. To Taylor's translation is devoted more space than to any of the others; as in the case of the others, numerous errors in translation are pointed out, but the author's judgment regarding Taylor's translation is unmistakably favorable: "Kraft,

* Cf. review of Rea's book, *Journal of Eng. and Germ. Phil.* Vol. VIII, No. 2.

Tiefe, ernste Kunst zeichnet seine Arbeit aus, es weht in ihr ein starker poetischer Geist. Von allen Übersetzungen, die ich gelesen, kommt sie nach meinem Empfinden dem Original am nächsten." McLintock's translation, containing many beautiful passages in the metres of the original, marks a backward step in the development of the English translations of *Faust*. "Gehaltlich," concludes the author, "ist also diese jüngste Übersetzung ein grosser Rückschritt; sie reicht bei weitem nicht an die Taylor'sche heran."

L. Baumann's careful bibliographical list, critical resumé of the important English translations of *Faust*, and final conclusion that Bayard Taylor's is the best of all English translations, make easier the discussion of a recent detailed study of Taylor's work.

Whereas Rea's work reviews practically all the English translations of Schiller's dramas, and L. Baumann's, though citing all the English versions of the first part of Goethe's *Faust*, discusses in detail only the six most important translations, Mrs. Haskell's thesis deals with only one *Faust* translation, that of the American writer Bayard Taylor.

Mrs. Haskell is concerned, as Professor Calvin Thomas points out in an introductory note, not with the question whether Taylor's version is better than any other nor with the question whether Taylor's is the best we are likely to get in the exact metres of the original. Her problem is to decide whether Taylor's *Faust* is poetry, and whether Goethe's poetry has been sacrificed to Taylor's theory of translation—a theory which involves the abnegation of the translator's personality, a nearly equal knowledge, on the part of the translator, of both languages, an exact reproduction of the words, phrases, rhymes, and metres of the original, and, finally, a thoroughly poetic talent and inspiration in the translator.

By citing the opinions of a number of literary critics and historians, Mrs. Haskell concludes that Taylor was a hard-working master of technique, but not a poet; he was a thorough student of Goethe, and possessed a thorough knowledge of German, yet "his translation as a whole does not meet the demands which may reasonably be made upon it." Taylor's theory of translation, particularly his insistence that the metres and rhymes of the original be preserved, is combatted.

This part of Taylor's theory deserves fuller discussion. Arbitrary metres, according to Taylor, are not to be endured, for "the white light of Goethe's thought is thereby passed through the tinted glass of other minds" and assumes "the coloring of each."

Mrs. Haskell rightly observes that such would be the case in any version. We might well add that if the light is passed not only through other minds but also through other metres the danger of deviating from the original is greatly increased. Mrs. Haskell does not state, moreover, that Taylor's translation would have been better if the original metres had not been adhered to.

In a number of cases—particularly in the "König von Thule"—Taylor is unable to reproduce exactly the rhymes of the original. Yet this lyric, according to Mrs. Haskell, "was perverse enough to turn out the best thing in Taylor's whole translation." It might be of interest to note, in this connection, that of the thirty-five English translations of *Faust* mentioned in L. Baumann's book—a book, by the way, which though published a year earlier than Mrs. Haskell's, is not taken into consideration in the latter's study—those translations which have attempted to reproduce the rhymes and metres of the original (Taylor, Brooks, Arnold, Claudy, Latham, McLintock, and to a certain extent, Swanwick and a few others) have been perverse enough to turn out the best among all the English translations.

Evidently, then, "form" has played an important part in *Faust* translations. Shelley's couplet from the "Walpurgis-Nacht":

The giant-snouted crags ho! ho!

How they snort and how they blow!

is praised both by Taylor and by Mrs. Haskell. We must remember, however, that Shelley's translation is a fragment, also that Shelley himself realized the weak points in his work. He employs rhyme, for instance, in only about one-third of the five hundred odd lines that he translated. In a letter from Pisa to John Gisborne, January 1822 (ed. G. E. Woodberry, IV, 427) Shelley says: "The translations [of *Faust*], both these and in *Blackwood*, are miserable. Ask Coleridge if their stupid misintelligence of the deep wisdom and harmony of the author does not spur him to action." And in another letter from Pisa to Gisborne, April 10, 1822 (Woodberry IV, 428), referring to his translations: "I am well content with those from Calderon, which in fact gave me very little trouble; but those from *Faust*—I feel how imperfect a representation, even with all the license I assume to figure to myself how Goethe would have written in English, my words convey. No one but Coleridge is capable of this work." How many great poets may have been deterred from translating *Faust* because they felt that they could not reproduce in English the forms and rhymes of the original—Coleridge, the man whom Shelley twice calls upon for this task, hesitated from translating *Wallensteins Lager* for this very reason—can only be surmised.

Mrs. Haskell first analyzes Taylor's version to determine whether it is a good translation. In a number of cases he has an extra line not warranted by the original, in a number of others he has not reproduced one of the original lines; he frequently uses words of Latin origin which do not convey the meaning of Goethe's native words; he introduces unnecessary words (also comparatives and superlatives), and phrases ("I fear," "in short," "the fact is" etc.). In several cases he has mistranslated.

The third chapter is entitled "The English of Taylor's Translation." Mrs. Haskell attributes to Taylor's formal fidelity that his work, as Professor Barrett Wendell puts it, "in no wise resembles normal English." Where Taylor is un-English, she says, he is usually German. Thus she censures his persistent use of nominalized adjectives, of unnecessary inversions, of curious capitalizations, of the so-called transposed order of words in dependent clauses, of an adverbial particle at the end of a clause, of clipped forms as "ware" for "aware," "stead" for "instead," "mid" for "amid," "'tis," "'twas," "'t were," etc., of the pronoun "ye," of imperfect rhymes, and of archaic, obsolete, and dialectic forms. The summaries are searching but helpful. In many instances—inversions, clipped forms, imperfect rhymes, archaic expressions—it would be extremely difficult to lay down definite rules. There are so-called technical imperfections even in Goethe's original. It must be borne in mind also that the faults pointed out by Mrs. Haskell are scattered over a poem of twelve thousand lines; we are apt to overlook the passages which have been praised and admired by other commentators.

The fourth chapter is concerned with the poetic worth of Taylor's translation. Mrs. Haskell does not hesitate to assert that Taylor's *Faust* is not poetry. Her final conclusion is unusually severe: "He has Latinized, sophisticated, diluted, padded and stripped off poetry until all vital semblance of the original has been lost." Only a few lines—several stanzas from the "Song of the Archangels," the entire ballad of the "King of Thule," and eleven lines from the second part—are regarded worthy of a place in an eclectic translation of *Faust*. If Taylor's translation—acknowledged by Professor Boyesen and by L. Baumann as the best among all English translations—deserves no better praise than that accorded in the above conclusion, surely English-speaking readers will have little hope of gaining a conception of Goethe's *Faust* except through the German original.

Mrs. Haskell's study has been well worth while. Its conclusion, however, will cause surprise to those who, like Boyesen, von Loeper, Arn. Krause, R. M. Meyer, L. Baumann, and others,

have always regarded Bayard Taylor's version a poetical and highly creditable translation of Goethe's *Faust*.

Dr. Hauhart's thesis, like Mrs. Haskell's, is one of the Columbia University Germanic Studies. Its main purpose is indicated by its title. It does not confine itself merely to the English translations of *Faust*, but takes up also the criticisms of *Faust* by various English writers and reviewers. The work is filled with a mass of facts, many of which have been generally known, but all of which, when brought together, are of genuine interest.

Hauhart divides his thesis into six chapters dealing respectively with the attitude toward German literature at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the criticisms of *Faust* in English magazines, the views of eminent English writers on *Faust*, the theory of translation, the translations of the first part of *Faust* up to 1850, and a general bibliography.

Six reasons are adduced for the tardy recognition of German literature in England—(1) an insufficient knowledge of the German language, (2) the poor opinion of Germany and things German that prevailed in Europe, (3) the predominant influence of French literature, (4) the general difference in the character of the Germans and English, (5) the great expense connected with printing and the duty on imported books, and (6) the lack of competent mediators before 1790 who appreciated the treasures of German literature. The second and the sixth reasons, it would seem, are really corollaries of the first, namely the lack of knowledge of the language. The fourth reason is also somewhat sweeping; are the differences between the character of the English and Germans any greater than, for instance, between the English and French? The fifth reason regarding the high duty on imported books might apply to French books as well as to German. The real reason for the lack of interest in German literature is referred to on the first page of the study; the Germans had little to offer between the end of the Thirty Years' War and the latter part of the eighteenth century. The appearance in Germany of such stirring works as Goethe's *Götz* and *Werther* and Schiller's *Räuber* soon stimulated interest in England.

Of the earlier meditators Hauhart mentions William Taylor of Norwich, Matthew Gregory ("Monk") Lewis, Henry Crabb Robinson, and Robert Pearse Gillies. Coleridge, Carlyle, Hayward, etc. are mentioned in later chapters. It would be well to give a note also to Joseph Mellish, the able translator of *Maria Stuart*, who had close relations with Goethe and Schiller.

Turning to magazine criticisms, Hauhart finds that the early reviewers thoroughly misunderstood Goethe and his work. Al-

though *Faust* is mentioned in the *Monthly Review* as early as 1798, the first extended review appeared in 1810. The reviewer, supposed to be William Taylor of Norwich, concludes that *Faust* can be recommended neither for importation nor translation. The translation of Madame de Staël's *De l'Allemagne* (1813) and of A. W. Schlegel's *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature* (1815), the outlines of *Faust* in connection with Retzsch's illustrations (1820), and the early translations of *Faust* by Gower, Hayward, Anster, and others, were followed by many reviews of *Faust* in the various magazines. The Prologue disturbed most of the reviewers; they seem to have regarded its language blasphemous. At all events, the English were slow to appreciate the real purport of Goethe's work.

In the chapter on the attitude of eminent literary men toward *Faust*, Hauhart selects for special mention Carlyle, Coleridge, Byron, Scott, and Lamb. Other writers—Wordsworth, Southey, De Quincey, Macauley—showed no special interest in *Faust*. Shelley is mentioned among the translators. Of the five men selected, Byron and Lamb knew no German and Scott very little. Though Byron's knowledge of *Faust* came mainly through Monk Lewis's oral translation, he seems to have been deeply interested in it; the question whether his *Manfred* owes much to *Faust* has given rise to frequent discussions. Scott read *Faust* in 1818, and discussed the poem with Lockhart; the latter's short summary of Scott's statement is the only thread that connects Scott with *Faust*. Lamb, who had no use for Goethe, knew of *Faust* only through Madame de Staël's book and through Gower's version. Lamb's remarks on *Faust* in a few of his letters are of interest but of no special significance. Scott and Lamb might well have been classed with other writers who produced nothing of special interest bearing on *Faust*.

Coleridge and Carlyle are more important. Whether Coleridge had an excellent knowledge of German and whether he was better prepared than Carlyle to act as an apostle of German literature and culture (as Hauhart states on p. 63) may be doubted. We may question also whether Coleridge's lukewarm reception of Goethe's work and his "aloofness" were "proof positive" to Englishmen that there was little of merit in German literature. It would be difficult to show how far a tardy recognition of a literature was due to any one man's aloofness. But Coleridge's attitude, as outlined by Hauhart, is of fascinating interest. Coleridge rated Goethe below Schiller; he translated two parts of *Wallenstein*, but nothing came of the project discussed in 1814 with the publisher Murray regarding a translation of *Faust*. Coleridge's objections to Goethe's work seem to be based mainly on the language of the Prologue.

The most important of the five English writers selected by Hauhart, in fact the most important exponent of *Faust* in England before 1850, is undoubtedly Carlyle. His criticism of *Faust* in the *New Edinburgh Review* in 1822 was the first careful summary of the poem; here he mentioned also the need of a good translation of *Faust*, and added a few specimen translations of his own. In 1827 he published an article on the "Helena," which called forth a letter of appreciation from Goethe. Thus started the correspondence between the two. Goethe urged Carlyle to translate *Faust*, and the latter seemed ready to undertake the work. Goethe's death in 1832 cut off, as Hauhart says, the source of Carlyle's personal inspiration. Fifty years after reading the first part, Carlyle, in his letters, still shows a deep interest in *Faust*. Carlyle's relation to German literature has been treated by Streuli and by Kraeger. This may explain why Hauhart devotes only eleven pages to a hasty sketch of so important a mediator as Carlyle.

Before taking up the *Faust* translations, Hauhart discusses in the fourth chapter the theories of translation. A few general considerations lead up to a review of the difficulties of translating *Faust*. This section is devoted largely to the problem of dealing with the feminine rhymes of the original. English, he says, suffers from an overabundance of short words, and possesses very few words that naturally form feminine rhymes like "ever," "never," etc. The translator has recourse to the present participle in "ing," the preterite and past participle of verbs in "ed," nouns in "ion," combinations of words which give the effect of the feminine rhymes like "know it" and "show it," and finally the small number of words which naturally form double rhymes that do not have the awkward effect of the continued repetition of rhymes in "ing," "ed," "ion" or of word combinations.

Hauhart maintains that a consistent imitation of the feminine rhymes does violence to English, and leaves an effect of awkwardness and stiffness. We might answer that it depends entirely on the skill and good taste of the translator. English poetry contains many feminine rhymes; there is no inherent objection to their use. As for the continued repetition of rhymes in "ing," "ed," "ion," etc. we might add that in German the rhyme in "en" predominates; it occurs in infinitives, in the past participles of strong verbs, in the plurals of weak nouns, and in the oblique cases of the singular of some nouns. In fact, of the feminine rhymes in the first part of *Faust* more than two-thirds end in "en," of those in *Wallensteins Lager* about three-fourths end in "en." If there were any advantage in variety, the advantage would be with the English. As a matter of fact, however, the nature of the last syllable in a feminine rhyme is comparatively unimportant; the next to the last syllable has the stress.

The use of word combinations to eke out feminine rhymes is particularly condemned by Hauhart. He admits that such combinations have been used by poets, for instance by Byron and the Brownings. "But nevertheless," he continues, "their use in translating can not be defended on this ground. They are not a usual characteristic of good English poetry, and no one will claim special elegance for them, even where they are used by great English poets." If the poets are not to be considered in the matter, what criterion are we to heed? Swinburne has written the following lines:

If love were what the rose is,
 And I were like the leaf,
 Our lives would grow together
 In sad or singing weather,
 Blown fields or flowerfull closes,
 Green pastures or gray grief;
 If love were what the rose is,
 And I were like the leaf.

A writer in the *Outlook* of April 24, 1909 expresses his admiration by saying: "What could be more perfect than these lines?" Here Swinburne employs the words "together" and "weather"—words which, as Hauhart would say, naturally form feminine rhymes. But Swinburne also boldly uses a word combination "rose is" to rhyme with "closes." Shelley in the matchless opening lines of *To a Skylark* rhymes "spirit" and "near it." The point is simply this: if the poetry is good, the presence of a word combination detracts little or nothing. We must take into consideration that such combinations are used by poets; if Byron, the Brownings, Wordsworth, Scott, Lamb, Bayard Taylor, Swinburne and others use such combinations, the reader will soon become familiar with the principle. Such combinations are not to be condemned *per se*. Neither are feminine rhymes in general to be condemned in English translations. Many translators believe that the reproduction of the form of the original is essential. Such translators have the right to try to reproduce the feminine rhymes. This is to be kept especially in mind in *Faust* where so many metres are used and almost two-fifths of the rhymes are feminine.

Hauhart mentions sixteen translations appearing before 1850. The list agrees essentially with L. Baumann's, but the two studies overlap only in the treatment of the Hayward, Anster, and Swanwick translations. One thing strikes us—the incompleteness of most of the early translations. Soane and Shelley translated only five or six hundred lines of *Faust*; Gower, the anonymous translator of 1834, Syme, Blackie, Hills, and Lefèvre either omitted parts, the Prologue for instance, or mutilated them. The

translations by Anster, the anonymous translator of 1838, Talbot, Birch, Filmore, and Knox deserve no special commendation. Only two are of importance—Hayward's careful prose version and Miss Swanwick's poetic version. Like Mrs. Haskell, Hauhart objects to inversions and Latinized expressions; both occur in Miss Swanwick's version. In the main, however, Miss Swanwick's attempt is praiseworthy. When we learn how poor most of the early translations were, we must regret that neither Coleridge nor Carlyle translated *Faust*.

A general bibliography and an index conclude Dr. Hauhart's commendable thesis. What would be the general conclusions? Did the interest in *Faust* among literary men centre in Carlyle? Did Hayward's prose version give the real impulse toward translations? Was the interest before 1850 in any one German work—in *Werther* or in *Wallenstein* for instance—greater than that in *Faust*? Was *Faust* studied in any English university before 1850? (The first definite announcement that *Faust* was read at Harvard occurs in a catalogue of 1854-55; it is not improbable, however, that Karl Follen took up *Faust* in his classes during his term of teaching between 1825 and 1835). Many vistas are opened by Dr. Hauhart's thesis; it should pave the way for similar studies on other German works.

FREDERICK W. C. LIEDER.

Harvard University.

LENAUS WERKE. In zwei Teilen. Auf Grund der Hempel'schen Ausgabe neu herausgegeben mit Einleitungen und Anmerkungen versehen von Carl August von Bloedau. Berlin, Leipzig, Wien, Stuttgart. Deutsches Verlagshaus Bong & Co. o. J. (1909). LXXXII, 355, 431.

Das Verlagshaus Bong & Co. hat sich die Aufgabe gestellt, die bei Hempel erschienenen deutschen Klassiker dem heutigen Stand der Wissenschaft entsprechend neu herauszugeben. Daz auch Lenau hierbei berücksichtigt werden muszte, ist selbstverständlich, und dasz die neue Ausgabe so zufriedenstellend ausgefallen ist, musz allen Verehrern Lenaus besonders erfreulich erscheinen. Bloedau gibt in der Einleitung ein mit festen Strichen gezeichnetes Lebensbild des Dichters, und zwar mit Heranziehung alles in den letzten Jahren (besonders von dem unermüdlichen Castle) herausgegebenen neuen Materials.

Gelungen ist wohl besonders die Darstellung der Entwicklung der Jugend Lenaus, ferner die Charakterisierung von Sophie